

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1-30 and 37-78 are pending in this Application. Claim 1, 37, and 67 are currently amended. Claims 1-30 and 37-78 remain pending in the Application after entry of this Amendment. No new matter has been entered.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-7, 9, 11-16, 18, 19, 21-23, 25, 26, 30, 37-43, 45, 47-52, 54, 55, 57-59, 61, 62, 66-69, 71-75, and 78 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,706,097 to Schelling et al. (hereinafter "Schelling") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,485,554 to Lowitz et al. (hereinafter "Lowitz").

The Examiner rejected claims 8, 17, 20, 27-29, 44, 53, 56, 63-65, 70, and 77 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schelling, in view of Lowitz, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,098,082 to Gibbon et al. (hereinafter "Gibbon").

The Examiner rejected claims 10 and 46 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schelling, in view of Lowitz, in further view of Gibbon, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,098,082 to Geaghan et al. (hereinafter "Geaghan").

The Examiner rejected claims 24, 60 and 76 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schelling, in view of Lowitz, and in further view of Geaghan.

#### **Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections and request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on Schelling, Lowitz, Gibbon, and Geaghan. The Examiner makes the allegation that the combination of references teach or disclose all of the claimed limitations of the corresponding claims and that one having ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to incorporate the teachings of Schelling with the teachings of Lowitz, Gibbon, and Geaghan.

Applicants respectfully submit that in the Office Action, a prima facie case of obviousness in the Office Action has not been established. In order to establish a prima facie showing of obviousness, three requirements must be satisfied: all limitations of a pending claim must be expressly or impliedly disclosed by prior art references; there must be a suggestion or

motivation in the art for the ordinarily skilled artisan to combine the limitations; and there must be a reasonable expectation of success in making such a combination. (M.P.E.P. § 2143). Applicants submit that Schelling, Lowitz, Gibbon, and Geaghan, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest at least one of the claimed limitations recited in each of the corresponding claims.

Claim 1

Claim 1 recites a computer-implemented method of generating a printable representation for an electronically stored multimedia document storing multimedia information, the multimedia information comprising information of at least a first type and information of a second type. The method of claim 1 includes accessing layout information specifying a first layout feature associated with how the first type of information is to be arranged when printed on a paper medium and specifying a second layout feature associated with how the second type of information is to be arranged when printed on the paper medium. As recited in claim 1, the printable representation for the multimedia information stored in the multimedia document is automatically generated based upon the layout information. The printable representation recited in claim 1 for the multimedia document comprises a printable representation for information of the first type and a printable representation for information of the second type. The printable representation of the multimedia document recited in claim 1 is capable of being printed on a paper medium.

Applicants submit that Schelling and Lowitz, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above-recited features of claim 1.

The Office Action readily acknowledges that Schelling does not teach or suggest the feature of “accessing layout information...” as recited in claim 1. To cure the deficiencies of Schelling, the Examiner alleges that it is well known to provide a “print preview” or “print layout” for automatically generating printable representations for documents according to a layout. In the previous response, Applicants argued that the conventional “print preview” feature in computers simply provides a user with a preview of the document that will be printed. There

is no layout information that specifies how the first type and second type of information in a multimedia document are to be printed on the paper medium as recited by claim 1. In response, the Office Action states that the print preview to enable users to select how information is to be printed on a paper medium, such as portrait or landscape. The Examiner observed that the claims do not recite “specifying how the content of the first type and second type of information is arranged on the document” (emphasis added). In response, Applicants have amended claim 1 to recite the feature of accessing layout information specifying “a first layout feature associated with how the first type of information is to be arranged when printed on a paper medium” and “a second layout feature associated with how the second type of information is to be arranged when printed on the paper medium.”

A user accessing a portrait mode, landscape mode, or number of copies of a document to print provided by the conventional “print preview” (or “print layout”) does not constitute the recited “accessing layout information specifying a first layout feature associated with how the first type of information is to be arranged when printed on a paper medium and specifying a second layout feature associated with how the second type of information is to be arranged when printed on the paper medium” of claim 1 (emphasis added). As discussed above, the portrait and landscape mode simply orient the paper medium. Moreover, the “print layout” refers to the organization of the printing of multiple documents, such as the number of copies and has nothing to do with “specifying...how the first type of information is to be arranged when printed on a paper medium,” (emphasis added) as recited in claim 1.

Applicants further submit that Lowitz does not cure the deficiencies of Schelling and the “print layout” as alleged in the Office Action. Lowitz was cited at Col. 4, lines 8-25 for teaching the recited “automatically generating the printable representation ... based upon the layout information.” While the layout information of Lowitz includes controlling the size, position, and format of one or more video images in Col. 4, lines 8 and 9, the layout information of Lowitz, however, is not directed to the contents of the video images. Lowitz does not identify a first type of information and a second type of information in the video images. The layout information of Lowitz thus does not specify “how the first type of information is to be arranged

when printed on a paper medium and ... how the second type of information is to be arranged when printed on the paper medium” as recited in claim 1.

Additionally, the Office Action merely relies on Lowitz for its teaching of “automatically generating index images.” Based on the above, Applicants submit that the “automatically generating index images” of Lowitz does not teach or suggest the features of “accessing layout information...” and “automatically generating the printable representation for the multimedia information stored in the multimedia document based upon the layout information...” as recited in claim 1.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 1 is allowable.

#### Claim 21

Claim 21 recites a computer-implemented method of generating a paper document for a electronically stored multimedia document, the multimedia document storing multimedia information that includes video information. As recited in claim 21, one or more video keyframes are printed in a first area of a page of the paper document, wherein the one or more video keyframes are extracted from the video information occurring during a time span associated with the page, the time span characterized by a first time and a second time. As recited in claim 21, text information is printed in a second area of the page of the paper document, wherein the text information printed in the second area is extracted from the multimedia information occurring during the time span associated with the page.

Applicants submit that Schelling and Lowitz, either individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the above-recited features of claim 21. In particular, Applicants submit that Lowitz does not teach or suggest “the text information printed in the second area is extracted from the multimedia information occurring during the time span associated with the page” as recited in claim 21.

In responding the Applicants’ previous arguments, the Office Action states on page 4 that Lowitz is relied to cure the deficiencies of Schelling for its teaching of “index information” for identifying a sequential location (time code), “time information” associated

with a page, and identifiers used for correlating a first type of information with a second type of information. However, even if Lowitz discloses the “index information,” “time information,” and identifiers as suggested in the Office Action, Lowitz still fails to teach or suggest text information printed in the second area as recited in claim 21 that is extracted from the multimedia information occurring during the time span associated with the page. Lowitz teaches printing an identifier or an index, neither of which is textual information extracted from the multimedia information. Furthermore, Lowitz teach printing textual information associated with image, headers, time stamp information, time code information, and page numbers. Lowitz merely discloses printing of textual representations of numeric information that may or may not be extracted from a video clip. The printing of textual representation in Lowitz is substantially different from the printing of extracted textual information from the multimedia information occurring during the time span associated with the page as recited in claim 21.

Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 21 is allowable.

Claims 2-20, 22-30 and 37-78

Applicants submit that independent claims 37, 57, 67, and 74 are allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of claims 1 and 21, and others. Applicants submit that dependent claims 2-20, 22-30, 38-56, 58-66, 68-73, and 75-78 that depend directly and/or indirectly from the independent claims 1, 21, 37, 57, 67, and 74 respectively, are also allowable for at least a similar rationale as discussed above for the allowability of the independent claims. Applicants further submit that the dependent claims recite additional features that make the dependent claims allowable for additional reasons.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Sean F. Parmenter/  
Sean F. Parmenter  
Reg. No. 53,437

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: 650-326-2400  
Fax: 650-326-2422  
SFP:am  
60743861 v1